



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

N✓
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/626,336	07/24/2003	Justin K. Brask	ITL.1022US (P16709)	1387
7590	09/24/2004		EXAMINER	
Timothy N. Trop TROP. PRUNER & HU, P.C. STE 100 8554 KATY FWY HOUSTON, TX 77024-1841			NADAV, ORI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2811	
			DATE MAILED: 09/24/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/626,336	BRASK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	ori nadav	2811

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 August 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the "Information for Officemates" for details of the use of the asterisk.

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election of claims 1-20 in the reply filed on 8/6/2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

Information Disclosure Statement

If applicant is aware of any relevant prior art, he/she requested to cite it on form PTO-1449 in accordance with the guidelines set forth in M.P.E.P. 609.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 10, 13-15, 17 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Tsuzumitani et al. (6,645,807).

Tsuzumitani et al. teach in figure 1 and related text a method comprising: forming a metal oxide dielectric 7A using a liquid oxidizer selected from the group including solutions of O₃, H₂O₂ and organic peroxide (column 7, lines 42-45), over a silicon substrate, and forming a dielectric using a metallic precursor; and oxidizing said metallic precursor in a liquid.

Regarding claim 14, the claimed limitations of oxidizing said metallic precursor in a liquid without forming an oxidized layer under the metallic precursor, are inherent in Tsuzumitani et al.'s device, because Tsuzumitani et al.'s structure is formed in the same process as that of the claimed structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 6, 9, 11, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzumitani et al. in view of Yao (6,679,996).

Regarding claims 3, 11 and 18, Tsuzumitani et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 1 above, except forming the metal oxide dielectric of hafnium, zirconium, or tantalum.

Yao teaches in figure 1A forming the metal oxide dielectric 3 of hafnium, zirconium, or tantalum (column 4, lines 18-30).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to form the metal oxide dielectric of hafnium, zirconium, or tantalum, in Tsuzumitani et al.'s device, in order to use the appropriate material for the application in hand. Note that substitution of materials is not patentable even when the substitution is new and useful. *Safetran Systems Corp. v. Federal Sign & Signal Corp.* (DC NIII, 1981) 215 USPQ 979.

Regarding claims 6, 9 and 16, Yao teaches using a liquid oxidizer includes using an oxidizer in an aqueous solution (column 3, line 24).

Claims 4, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuzumitani et al. in view of Garcia (5,836,150).

Regarding claims 3, 11 and 18, Tsuzumitani et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure, as applied to claim 1 above, except using physical vapor deposition to deposit metal atoms.

Garcia teaches using physical vapor deposition or chemical vapor deposition to deposit metal atoms (column 4, lines 29-33).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use physical vapor deposition to deposit metal atoms, in Tsuzumitani et al.'s device, in order to use most suitable conventional vapor deposition for the application in hand.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References N-P are cited as being related to forming a metal oxide dielectric using a liquid oxidizer.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology center (TC) 2800 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to TC 2800 via the TC 2800 Fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4-C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Group 2811 Fax Center number is (703) 308-7722 and 308-7724. The Group 2811 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Group 2811 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or any earlier communication from the Examiner should be directed to *Examiner Nadav* whose telephone number is **(571) 272-1660**. The Examiner is in the Office generally between the hours of 7 AM to 4 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Technology Center Receptionists** whose telephone number is **308-0956**



O.N.
9/16/04

ORI NADAV
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800